

**REMARKS****Status of Claims**

The Office Action mailed January 3, 2007 has been reviewed and the comments therein were carefully considered. Claims 1, 3 – 14 and 16 are currently pending. Claims 1, 3 – 14 and 16 are rejected.

**New Counsel**

Applicant notes that new counsel has been appointed for this patent application. Because of the timing of this response, Applicant has not had time to file a new Power of Attorney and Change of Address form. Applicant shall file such forms as soon as possible.

**Specification**

The Office Action objects to the disclosure because of the term “For example” is used in the Abstract. Applicant notes that MPEP 608.01(b) does not state any prohibition about using that phrase. Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw this objection or provide a clear explanation about why this phrase is inappropriate.

**Claim Amendments**

Applicant has amended Claims 5, 7, 8, and 11 to correct some grammar and antecedent language errors that were introduced by the previous amendment. Applicant asserts that these amendments do not introduce any new subject matter.

**Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. 102**

Claims 1, 3 – 14 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Reynolds et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,934,963 B1) This rejection is respectfully traversed

The Office Action states “Regarding claim 1, Reynolds teaches this exact same technique as Reynolds shows as in Figure 15, while viewing a current video for a current channel, a user can select a second window screen with a second television program segment for displaying to

the user, and as soon as the user selects the second television program segment, modify or change the displaying of the window region of the first program to the second program accordingly (col. 19/lines 27-67 as the user selects one of the displaying program segment and hit OK to watch, the second program segment is displaying to the user).” Applicant respectfully notes that this is not what is recited by Claim 1; and further that the Office Action fails to show how Reynolds discloses each and every feature as recited by Claim 1.

Claim 1 recites, inter alia, “the video screen comprising a window region continuing to display an indication of the first television program segment simultaneously in a main program screen with the second television program segment;”. Reynolds does not disclose this feature either in Figure 15, or in Col. 19 lines 27-67. Figure 15 of Reynolds apparently discloses a program guide, and Col. 19 lines 27-67 disclose setting reminders by a user so the user will be reminded to watch future programs. None of this disclosure is related to what is recited in Claim 1.

Further, Claims 1 recites “modifying what is displayed to the user in the window region when the first television program segment is complete”. The Office Action does not include any description on how Reynolds discloses this feature. Applicant asserts that Reynolds does not disclose this feature. Accordingly, Applicant asserts that Reynolds does not teach or suggest all the features as claimed by Claim 1, and that Claim 1 and all claims that depend upon it are allowable.

The Office Action states that “For claim 11, Reynolds teaches an exact same method as cited, refer back to claim 1 above, and the user can select by clicking on the banner, i.e., another term, "selectable banner" (refer back again to Figs. 9a, 9b, 10 & 15).” Applicant respectfully notes that Claim 11 recites different subject matter than Claim 1, and the Office Action fails to describe how Reynolds discloses each and every feature of Claim 11.

Claim 11 recites, inter alia, “providing additional signal information representative of the first video program signal to be displayed in a window on a video screen while simultaneously displaying information other than said second video program in response to the input;”. No

explanation is provided for how Reynolds discloses this feature. Applicant asserts that Reynolds does not disclose this feature.

Accordingly, Applicant asserts that Claim 11 and all claims that depend upon it are allowable.

**Conclusion**

All rejections having been addressed, Applicant respectfully submits that the instant application is in condition for allowance, and respectfully solicits prompt notification of the same. Should the Examiner have any questions, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the number set forth below.

A petition for a three-month extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136(a) and the accompanying fee are filed herewith. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any such fees or credit any overpayment of fees to Deposit Account No. 19-0733.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: July 3, 2007

By: 

David D. Lowry  
Registration No. 38,538  
BANNER & WITCOFF, LTD.  
28 State Street, 28<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Boston, MA 02109-1775  
Telephone: 617-720-9600  
Fax: 617-720-9601